

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Francisco Corella

Serial No.: 09/483,185

Filed: January 14, 2000

Docket No.: 10991054-1

Title: AUTHORIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE BASED ON PUBLIC KEY CRYPTOGRAPHY

REMARKS

The following remarks are made in response to the Office Action mailed May 25, 2005. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 15, 16, and 18-24 were rejected. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 15, 16, and 18-24 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 6, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15, 18, 20, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Chapman et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,058,484 in view of the Riggins U.S. Patent No. 6,233,341.

The Examiner rejected claims 4, 5, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Chapman et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,058,484 in view of the Riggins U.S. Patent No. 6,233,341 in view of the Assay et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,903,882.

The Examiner rejected claims 7, 9, 19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Chapman et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,058,484 in view of the Riggins U.S. Patent No. 6,233,341 in view of the Howell U.S. Patent No. 5,276,901.

The Examiner rejected claims 11 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Chapman et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,058,484 in view of the Riggins U.S. Patent No. 6,233,341 in view of the Maruyama U.S. Patent No. 6,393,563.

The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Chapman et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,058,484 in view of the Riggins U.S. Patent No. 6,233,341 in view of the Kausik U.S. Patent No. 6,263,446.

Applicant respectfully notes that the Examiner had previously provisionally allowed previous dependent claims 5 and 17 and objected to these claims for being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim in the Office Action mailed December 9, 2004. In the Response to that Office Action which was filed March 9, 2005, Applicant amended independent claim 1 to include the limitations of previous intervening dependent claim 2 and previous provisionally allowed dependent claim 5. In the March 9, 2005 Response, Applicant amended independent claim 13 to include the limitations of previous intervening dependent claim 14 and previous provisionally allowed dependent claim 17. In the March 9, 2005 Response, Applicant accordingly cancelled claims 2, 5, 14, and 17 without

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Francisco Corella

Serial No.: 09/483,185

Filed: January 14, 2000

Docket No.: 10991054-1

Title: AUTHORIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE BASED ON PUBLIC KEY CRYPTOGRAPHY

prejudice. In the current Office Action, the Examiner has withdrawn the previous allowability of claims 5 and 17 in view of the Assay et al. patent. Since Applicant previously amended independent claim 1 and independent claim 13, current pending independent claim 1 and current pending independent claim 13 are rejected based on a combination of the Chapman et al. patent, the Riggins patent, and the Assay et al. patent.

The Examiner admits that the Chapman et al. patent does not disclose a short-term public key certificate. The Examiner relies on the Riggins patent which teaches temporary certificates. Nevertheless, the Examiner does not cite a reference for a directory for storing short-term authorization information related to the user as recited in independent claim 1. The Riggins patent does not teach or suggest a directory for short-term authorization information related to the user, and thus also does not teach a short-term certificate binding the public key of the user to long-term identification information related to the user from the long-term certificate and to **the short-term authorization information related to the user from the directory** as recited in independent claim 1.

Moreover, as to independent claims 1 and 13, the Examiner states that the Assay patent “discloses that a certificate that becomes invalid by age need not be on the schedule CRL, because the age has already rendered the short-term certificate invalid, (Col 3, lines 1-4).” However, the Assay et al. patent does not teach short-term certificates and in fact does not teach certificates which are “not subject to revocation” as required by the limitations of independent claims 1 and 13. Instead, the Assay et al. specifically states at column 3, lines 1-4 that “certificates which become invalid by virtue of their age need not be listed in a CRL because each certificate contains its own expiration date.” This passage in the Assay et al. specifically refers to that if a certificate has become invalid because of its age expiration, there is then no longer a need for a listing in a CRL, but if the certificate has not yet become invalid by virtue of its age, it would then be listed in a CRL. Thus, the Assay et al. patent does not teach or suggest a short-term certificate that is not subject to revocation.

Furthermore, there is no teaching or suggestion to combine any teaching of the Assay et al. patent with the Riggins patent. In fact, Riggins teaches away from a short-term certificate that is not subject to revocation. For example in the Abstract, the Riggins patent specifically states that “[t]he web server engine maintains a revocation list that contains information identifying revoked temporary certificates, so that a revoked but thusfar

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Francisco Corella

Serial No.: 09/483,185

Filed: January 14, 2000

Docket No.: 10991054-1

Title: AUTHORIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE BASED ON PUBLIC KEY CRYPTOGRAPHY

unexpired certificate can not be improperly used. The web site reviews the temporary certificate for authenticity and contacts the global server cite to review the revocation list and determine whether the temporary certificate has been revoked.”

There is also no reasonable expectation of success for this suggested combination as stated in the Riggins patent at column 3, lines 17-19 “[t]emporary certificates can safely be installed because they expire quickly and can be revoked when the user leaves the remote site.” and as stated at column 14, lines 46-48 “the secure communications engine 147 determines if the temporary certificate 400 has expired or whether the user has logged out.” Thus, in the Riggins system that uses a temporary certificate at a remote site, the system requires that when the user logs out of the remote site that the temporary certificate is revoked. Thus there would be no reasonable expectation success if such capabilities would be removed from the Riggins system.

In view of the above, the combination of the Chapman et al. patent, the Riggins patent, and the Assay et al. patent does not establish any of the three basic criteria of a *prima facie* case of obviousness (See MPEP 2143) toward independent claims 1 and 13.

Dependent claims 3, 4, and 6-12 are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim (claim 1) and are allowable on further independent grounds in view of the novel and nonobvious features and combinations set for therein. Dependent claims 15, 16, and 18-24 are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim (claim 13) and are allowable on further independent grounds in view of the novel and nonobvious features and combinations set forth therein.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the above rejections and respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 15, 16, and 18-24.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 15, 16, and 18-24 are in form for allowance and are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 15, 16, and 18-24 is respectfully requested.

Amendment and Response

Applicant: Francisco Corella

Serial No.: 09/483,185

Filed: January 14, 2000

Docket No.: 10991054-1

Title: AUTHORIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE BASED ON PUBLIC KEY CRYPTOGRAPHY

No fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16(h)(i). However, if such fees are required, the Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's representative at the below-listed telephone numbers to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Any inquiry regarding this Response should be directed to either Patrick G. Billig at the below-listed telephone numbers or William P. O'Meara at Telephone No. (970) 898-7917, Facsimile No. (970) 898-7247. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

Francisco Corella,

By his attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC

Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250

100 South Fifth Street

Minneapolis, MN 55402

Telephone: (612) 573-2003

Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: 8-25-05

PGB:cmj


Patrick G. Billig

Reg. No. 38,080

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being deposited in the United States Postal Service, as first class mail, in an envelope address to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 25 day of August, 2005.

By: 
Name: Patrick G. Billig